





by the South in political affairs. It may  
and leave the evil spirit to support itself, it will fall  
by its own weakness. So thinks a bystander, who  
is an sometimes judge of a game better than the play-  
ers themselves.



NUMBER DCCCXLII.

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.  
Dunfermline, 1st month, 30th, 1847.

My dear Sir,  
I have been wishing to write to you for some time, but have been so busy that I could not find time to do so. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

We are delighted to hear that you are well, and hope you are the same. I am now at home, and I am very glad to hear from you. I am well, and hope you are the same.

ham. How I long to see them meet on the floor of the General Assembly! Mr. Macbeth delivered the second of the course. His arguments were similar to those in the 'Calm Review,' not excepting the (to me very objectionable) allusion to John Newton. Archdeacon Williams moved the vote of thanks, and, in doing so, said the Free Church had got into a scrape, among the hisses that followed showed that a number of that body were present, which is rather encouraging. There have not many joined the Society, but exertions are to be made soon to ascertain what number may be induced to come forward. A similar society has been formed in Glasgow, and other towns are expected to follow the good example.

Dr. Young, of Perth, delivered the third lecture, last Tuesday evening. It was so truly excellent, that the meeting voted for its publication. No better sermon could be preached to the Southern churches of America.

Yours, very respectfully,  
THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE IN SCOTLAND.  
DUNDEE, January 15, 1847.

My dear Sir:  
I have much pleasure in sending you, enclosed, a copy of 'An Address to the Office-bearers and Members of the Free Church of Scotland,' on her present connexion with the Slaveholding Churches of America. From the Committee of the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society. It will show you, better than any account I could send you, the present state of anti-slavery feeling amongst the members of the Free Church. It will gladden your heart to be assured, that, notwithstanding the crafty maneuvering of Dr. Candlish—the drum-major tone of Dr. Cunningham—and the transcendental distinctions between slave-holding and slave-holding, so opportunely invented by Dr. Duncan, to give an apparent color of consistency to his shameful apostasy, the people of the Free Church are again beginning to think aright regarding the conduct of the American Churches, in the matter of slavery. There were some among them, I believe, who held just views of the matter all along; and the wonder is, how the people generally were so slow to perceive the machinations of their leaders. But the fact is, they were so completely hoodwinked—bewitched, I should say—by Dr. Candlish, that they were over head and ears in the mire, ere they were aware. And besides, we must take into account, that the organs of the Free Church—the *Witness*, the *Wardens*, the *Guardians*, and the *Free Church Magazine*—have not been the faithful exponents of the people's views on this subject, but only that of their leaders and their subalterns. As for the poor, pitiful, time-serving expedient of Dr. Duncan, they would have been the veriest idiots not to have discovered its shallowness. They could not forget that, in 1845, he had uttered these words in the Free Presbytery of Edinburgh:—'Has this church nothing to do but sit down at the Lord's table with such unwelcome men—such traders in human flesh? I wonder how they can. As for myself, I could not eat a common meal with such men. It would choke me. I would count it foul to associate with such men.' And yet, with these declarations before the world, he dared to stand up in the General Assembly in 1846, the advocate and apologist of American man-stealers. But necessity is the parent of invention, and the learned Doctor finding, no doubt, that it would not do to stay in Rome and strive with the Pope, and remembering, besides, that discretion is oft times the better part of valor, set his wits to work to devise a plan, whereby to square his formerly repressed sentiments with the authoritative dicta of his redoubtable generalissimo, and, accordingly, one morning in May, he made the notable discovery, that slave-holding is not slave-holding. And great was the delight of that pious assembly, when the wonderful announcement was made! Shouts of triumph and thunders of applause burst from the grateful hearts of the free and the fair, then and there assembled, and frowns of holy rebuke were lavishly cast at Mr. Macbeth, who had so nobly dared, single-handed and alone in that Assembly, to defend the rights of humanity and the truth of God against the monstrous iniquity of those misguided men, who were laboring with all their might to force into unnatural and incongruous union, the immaculate daughter of the God of love, with the foul offspring of the devil—pride, piousness, heavenly Christianity, with the hideous, hell-born demon SLAVERY!

But it won't all do. Even slave-holding will not take with the folks in Scotland, not even though a Professor of Hebrew assure them that there is a great difference between that and slave-holding. They are *not* dull if they are apt to perceive the difference. They reason in this way:—If there be slave-holders, there must be slaves; and where there are slaves, there must be SLAVERY. And slavery won't go down at all with a true, unsophisticated Scotchman. It would choke him. No, no! Neither the sophistry of Dr. Candlish, nor the sound of Dr. Cunningham, nor the critical acumen of Dr. Duncan, can make that right which is wrong—'wrong' in its origin, wrong in its continuance, wrong in its effects, and wrong eternally. But, dear brother in a common cause, let us rejoice in hope, for I am persuaded the night of oppression is far spent—the day of release is at hand. To quote the language of the enclosed address, 'The decree is registered in heaven, and shall, in due time, be executed on the earth—THAT MAN SHALL NO MORE HOLD PROPERTY IN MAN. And, despite of all the obstacles that stand in the way—despite of tyrannical laws enacted by States—despite of slavish doctrines propagated by churches—the angel of freedom shall go forth through the globe, proclaiming liberty to every captive, and the opening of the prison-doors to them that are bound. Yes, even though slavery take refuge within the temple, and cling to the horns of the altar, it shall be dragged from thence, and hewn to pieces before the Lord.'

I may mention here, that the Free Church Anti-Slavery Society, whose committee have issued the enclosed document, are having a course of lectures delivered in Edinburgh, on the subjects discussed in the address. The first was by Dr. Willis of Glasgow—the second by Mr. Macbeth of the same place—and the third, which was delivered last week, was by Dr. Young of the United Secession, Perth. I see by the newspaper reports, the Dr. took occasion to vindicate and eulogize your untiring zeal and labors in the cause of abolition. Go on, then, in the good work, unflinchingly and cheerfully; for you have many a true heart with you, and in due time you shall reap, if you faint not.

The Dundee Anti-Slavery Society, which you will remember was formally constituted on the occasion of your first visit to Dundee, is, I am glad to say, prospering cheerfully. Members are being daily added to it. I enclose a copy of its constitution. It is true, we have not had any public meeting since you were here with Mr. George Thompson; but, at our last meeting of Committee, it was resolved to make arrangements for a course of lectures during the winter, on the subject of American slavery; but as these arrangements are not completed, I am unable at this time to give you any further information on that point. I have reason to hope, however, that the lectures, when they do take place, will be of the right stamp, and will not fail to do good service to the cause of abolition.

Perth, too, is all astir. They have got a good society there, an account of the formation of which you will see in a late number of the *Wardens*, which I sent you. I also send you a copy of their Constitution, which is almost the same as ours. Both are borrowed from that of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society. Enclosed, I also send you a few stanzas, put together in the course of last summer, partly original, and partly adapted from a manuscript in my possession.

Perth, too, is all astir. They have got a good society there, an account of the formation of which you will see in a late number of the *Wardens*, which I sent you. I also send you a copy of their Constitution, which is almost the same as ours. Both are borrowed from that of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society. Enclosed, I also send you a few stanzas, put together in the course of last summer, partly original, and partly adapted from a manuscript in my possession.

Perth, too, is all astir. They have got a good society there, an account of the formation of which you will see in a late number of the *Wardens*, which I sent you. I also send you a copy of their Constitution, which is almost the same as ours. Both are borrowed from that of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society. Enclosed, I also send you a few stanzas, put together in the course of last summer, partly original, and partly adapted from a manuscript in my possession.

Perth, too, is all astir. They have got a good society there, an account of the formation of which you will see in a late number of the *Wardens*, which I sent you. I also send you a copy of their Constitution, which is almost the same as ours. Both are borrowed from that of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society. Enclosed, I also send you a few stanzas, put together in the course of last summer, partly original, and partly adapted from a manuscript in my possession.

Perth, too, is all astir. They have got a good society there, an account of the formation of which you will see in a late number of the *Wardens*, which I sent you. I also send you a copy of their Constitution, which is almost the same as ours. Both are borrowed from that of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society. Enclosed, I also send you a few stanzas, put together in the course of last summer, partly original, and partly adapted from a manuscript in my possession.

tion, on a different subject, by a gentleman connected with the press, now, I believe, in America. The lines have, perhaps, little merit in a literary point of view; but as they breathe an anti-slavery spirit, they may, perhaps, be deemed worthy of a place in the poet's corner in your paper. I also send by this mail a copy of 'The Christian News,' (Glasgow paper), containing a rather affecting poem, called 'The Slave Ship,' which you may perhaps also deem worthy of insertion. These are but trifles; but, as I believe every thing bearing, however remotely, upon and against the giant evil you have been so long warring with, is welcome to you, I have ventured to direct your attention to these little things. Poetry has charms peculiarly its own, and to me it has ever been charming; and I believe I do no dishonor to either your head or your heart, when I venture to attribute to you kindred sympathies.

It only remains for me to thank you for your kindness and attention in sending me the *Witness*—seven numbers of which I have now received. I shall, in return, continue to send you the *Wardens* occasionally, and any other paper that comes in my way, containing anything important or interesting. Meantime, with best wishes for the prosperity of the great cause of abolition, to which you have devoted yourself, and for your health and preservation till you see the final triumph of that cause,

I remain, my dear Sir,  
Yours, faithfully and affectionately,  
JAMES McDONALD.

THE LONDON CHRISTIAN WITNESS.  
BELFAST, (Ireland), Jan. 20, 1847.

RESPECTED SIR:  
The accompanying letter is a copy of one which the writer sent to the Editor of the 'Christian Witness,' after reading his unfair attacks on you and the American Abolitionists, in his October and November numbers. Not being in the habit of writing for the press, I was not aware that communications for the 'Witness' had to be in the hands of the editor earlier than the 23d of each month. I therefore sent it off, so as to be in London about that time; but when I read his 'note to correspondents,' I thought that if it were ten days too late for the December publication, it would surely be in plenty of time for the January one. But it seems that it is not convenient for him to give either your letter, (which he unmanfully *Barked*), or the enclosed one to his readers. My object in sending this to you is to show, that there are some of Dr. Campbell's readers, who have no sympathy with him when attacking either private or public character, and then in a cowardly manner closing his pages against reply.

If the enclosed can be of any use to you, you are at perfect liberty to use it as you please. I am alone responsible for its contents. The other names are subscribers to the 'Witness,' as well as myself. I could have got more; but these were procured for the purpose of showing Dr. Campbell, that all his supporters were not of the same mind as himself on this matter.

Wishing you every success in your glorious efforts, and the downfall of every species of oppression,  
I am, respected Sir, truly yours,  
JAMES ROSE.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, Esq.  
BELFAST, Nov. 19, 1846.

To the Editor of the Christian Witness:  
Sir—We have read, with deep regret, an article in the *Witness* of November, commenting in strong terms on a letter which you say you had received from Mr. William Lloyd Garrison. We thought that common justice would have induced you, seeing that you had not space left for its insertion in your Magazine, to defer your comments till it was convenient for that gentleman's letter to appear. Instead of this, however, you constitute yourself the judge of the relevancy of that epistle, as a reply to the charge you had brought against him in a former number of the *Witness*, and at down deliberately, and write an article of considerable length—though you had said you had not room for the letter—denouncing, in no very measured language, the conduct and opinions of Mr. Garrison. At the same time, you leave your readers, in a great degree, ignorant of the reasons which Mr. G. gave in his letter, explanatory of the resolution on which you advertised in your October number. This conduct on your part, is to us, and to many more of your readers, very unfair and very unsatisfactory. If Mr. Garrison is, as you suppose him to be, an infidel, it is a shame for American ministers to let an infidel take the lead in such a righteous cause! But even an infidel, when he is attacked, should have the privilege of reply, and not be run down by garbled statements, taken from his opponents. How different the conduct of Mr. Garrison, in this respect, towards his traducers! He leaves a portion of his paper to any one who chooses to object to his opinions or projects, reserving to himself the right of applying an antidote. A lesson might here be learned by those who are perfectly orthodox.

British ministers should be very cautious that they injure not the influence of one who has been the most zealous, persevering and indefatigable exposé of the abomination of American slavery. Dr. Chalmers calls slavery, 'the essence of all villany'—the most correct definition of American slavery we have seen. Dr. Wardlaw says, 'American slavery, in all its characteristics, its bearing, and its results, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, I regard as all accursed things on the face of the earth, one of the most accursed;—and you yourself say, in reference to slavery, that 'the American churches are STEEPED IN CULP'—a sweeping charge certainly, as much so, in our estimation, as any of the resolutions which you impute to Mr. Garrison and his friends—one which requires some limitation or explanation. We would trust that all the churches in America are *not* steeped in this abominable crime; and, sir, if your denunciation requires limitation, you would surely give Mr. Garrison the same privilege, as you would claim for yourself, viz. to be the exponent of his own language; and were this granted, we are convinced that his fulminations extend to those who make large professions of Christianity, but whose actions and sentiments are at variance with their professions. It is reported that there are 1400 professed Christian ministers, slaveholders, in America, some of whom have declared that they would hang, or tar and feather, any abolitionist who would go to the slave States. Now, is it to be wondered at, that Garrison, for whose head \$5000 has been offered, should doubt the Christianity of such ministers? It astonishes us, that you and others should sympathize with such professors of Christianity. A different mode of testing Christians seems to be in vogue now, from that given in the New Testament, viz.—If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. 'By their fruits ye shall know them'—and, 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.' What would you think if 1400 ministers, with their adherents, in this country, were to commence sheep-stealing, and were determined to live principally by this practice? Would you have the charity to call them Christians, although they made strong professions of Christianity? and, moreover, to test their profession, they might occasionally sell a few of their stolen sheep, and give the proceeds to propagate their views? This, we consider, would be a trifling crime, compared with man-stealing; and still more so, when we know that not a few of these professors in America sell their own children—and this, too, in a land where they annually bluster, that every man is born free! Such inhuman barbarity must be pretty frequent; as we understand, from good authority, that nearly three-fourths of the slaves are approaching to white, and some of them are so fair and beautiful, that the eye of a slaveholder only can detect the black blood which runs in their veins.

We suppose you are aware, that the Presbyterian Church in America, when so steeped in the guilt of slavery as it now is, in explaining the eighth commandment, declared, that 'all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it, all who keep, sell, or buy slaves, are men-stealers—guilty of the highest kind of theft, and sinners of the first rank.' But when they became more steeped in guilt by the admission of slavery and slaveholders, they rescinded the declaration, and expunged it from their standards. Seeing that these things have taken place, we think that you and other British ministers should have counselled Dr. Cox, and the rest of the American brethren, (all thorough haters of slavery, according to their own statements), to forsake their evil ways, instead of attempting to destroy the usefulness of one who has been,—on Dr. Cox's own showing,—the most fearless and straightforward exposé of the accursed system. But let us see whether these men are such haters of slavery in their own country as they pretend to be, when they come to England. Dr. Cox was moderator of the New School Presbyterian General Assembly, last spring. Forty of its members were men-stealing professed Christian ministers. They received petitions from the people against slavery. After a long discussion on the subject, during which Dr. Cox threw every impediment he could in the way of the friends of the slave, it was postponed indefinitely. When this was accomplished, Dr. Cox rose, and thanked God that their Jesus was capped for another period of three years. Another gentleman, a Dr. Olin, cut a very prominent figure in the Evangelical Alliance as a great hater of slavery, yet this same Rev. Dr. said in the Conference held in New-York, 'Some doubt that they (the ministers) have a right to hold slaves. I do not. Those who doubt that members and ministers in the South have a right to hold slaves by the Constitution of the Church, may be very good men, but they are bad Methodists.'

I do not believe slaveholding is a disqualification for a Bishop, and I never will give such a vote. And after praising these southern slaveholding, man-stealing ministers for their piety, zeal, devotedness, &c. &c. he goes on to say, 'I am a slaveholder, and a minister myself, and had it not been for the fact that the climate did not agree with me, I should doubtless have been a slaveholder still.' These are the sentiments of men high in influence and office—the leaders, to a considerable degree, of public opinion in their own country, and men who have been honored during their visit to these countries. With such leaders, we are sorry to understand, public sentiment and public sympathy—particularly in the church—have become led to the claims of upwards of three millions of their suffering, down-trodden fellow-countrymen.

Before we close, allow us to give you the decision of a body of men, from whom we would naturally be led to expect an expression of sympathy for the slave—men set apart to speak of a pure morality, and the gospel of peace and good will to the heathen. Yet, strange to say, these men adopt no measures for giving the book which prescribes the purest of all morality—the Bible—nor express the slightest sympathy for the heathen at their own doors. The American Board of Foreign Missions met in New Haven, 8th Sept. 1846. Chancellor Walworth read a report on the memorial on slavery, the substance of which was, that the agitation on the question had an injurious effect, and therefore no action ought to be taken. Cool enough, certainly, for a Board of Missions!

We would feel obliged by your giving this place in your Magazine, and, if consistent with your arrangements, we would be much pleased were you to give Mr. Garrison's letter in full also. In the general management of your literary labors, you have our warmest sympathy and support.

We are, Mr. Editor,  
FRIENDS OF THE SLAVE.  
(Signed.)—James Rose, Robert Workman, Peter Dale, William Dale, James Shaw.

DR. CAMPBELL—THE ALLIANCE—HENRY CLAPP, JR.  
EXETER, (Devonshire), Dec. 1846.

My dear friend:  
I am heartily glad the snailish attempts to whisper away your reputation in this country have so signally failed. I believe that the great majority of the members of 'Orthodox' congregations even, who are at all informed and interested in the matter, as well as the best and most enlightened of their ministers, are thoroughly disgusted at the attempt to drown your voice by the malignant cry of 'Infidelity.' Dr. Campbell, though he has a share of many independence which we cannot but like, has shown himself very susceptible to the influences of the leprous point which certain bigots have poured into his ear, and ready to uphold the prejudices thus imbibed, with all the senseless, rocky stubbornness that usually characterizes such blind impostures. But though his influence is great with the less reflecting multitude of his school, there is, thank heaven, too much anti-slavery light about us now, to prevent the true character of the ferocious stabs he has blindly aimed at you being seen, even by his admirers themselves. The suppression of your reply has amazed and bewildered many of his readers. If he goes on thus, his own influence and reputation will soon be in the past tense.

There is an excellent article in the Eclectic Review of this month on Religious Fellowship with Slaveholders. The Eclectic is edited by Dr. Thomas Price, a Baptist, and is a periodical of high reputation amongst the cultivated portion of Orthodox non-conformists. The article is thoroughgoing in its condemnation of the Alliance, and it rebukes the calumnies of yourself and George Thompson. I trust the progress of the League here will be such as to cheer the hearts and strengthen the hands of yourself and noble band of faithful fellow-laborers in America. I shall deem it a rich and blessed privilege to give what little support may be in my power to a cause so man-loving and God-adoring. Oh! when will the time come, that Christians shall practically acknowledge the apostle's sentiment—'He that loveth not his brother,' &c. &c. You will doubtless hear of the proceedings of the British Branch of the Alliance at Manchester. Man-stealers are to be excluded. Well, better late than never. But how the testimony weakened! What humility, what laxity of principle, to shrink from speaking out in the presence of pro-slavery men, and then to ease conscience by venting indignation in their absence! It is impossible to avoid the conclusion, that had it not been for the agitation in which you and George Thompson so nobly led the van at Exeter Hall, &c. &c., the inquiry would have been allowed to wear the mantle of 'Evangelical Christianity' in Britain, as elsewhere.

Henry Clapp lectured on American slavery at our Athenaeum in Exeter, on Saturday last. On the whole, the lecture was good, confined to broad principles, and calculated to do good. But his Liberty party predilections came out a little towards the close, and he objected to calling all connected with slavery, indiscriminately, man-stealers. He mentioned some who had liberated their slaves, and asked whether we would call them man-stealers, a month before this act of justice. At the close of his lecture, I made a few remarks, commendatory in general, but expressive of dissent from some of his sentiments; and I asked him whether he would have hesitated to speak of one of your reformed drunkards as a drunkard, a month before his reformation? With a prayer that Heaven's blessing may be on your labors, I subscribe myself, dear friend,  
Yours, most sincerely,  
FRANCIS BISHOP.

We suppose you are aware, that the Presbyterian Church in America, when so steeped in the guilt of slavery as it now is, in explaining the eighth commandment, declared, that 'all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it, all who keep, sell, or buy slaves, are men-stealers—guilty of the highest kind of theft, and sinners of the first rank.' But when they became more steeped in guilt by the admission of slavery and slaveholders, they rescinded the declaration, and expunged it from their standards. Seeing that these things have taken place, we think that you and other British ministers should have counselled Dr. Cox, and the rest of the American brethren, (all thorough haters of slavery, according to their own statements), to forsake their evil ways, instead of attempting to destroy the usefulness of one who has been,—on Dr. Cox's own showing,—the most fearless and straightforward exposé of the accursed system. But let us see whether these men are such haters of slavery in their own country as they pretend to be, when they come to England. Dr. Cox was moderator of the New School Presbyterian General Assembly, last spring. Forty of its members were men-stealing professed Christian ministers. They received petitions from the people against slavery. After a long discussion on the subject, during which Dr. Cox threw every impediment he could in the way of the friends of the slave, it was postponed indefinitely. When this was accomplished, Dr. Cox rose, and thanked God that their Jesus was capped for another period of three years. Another gentleman, a Dr. Olin, cut a very prominent figure in the Evangelical Alliance as a great hater of slavery, yet this same Rev. Dr. said in the Conference held in New-York, 'Some doubt that they (the ministers) have a right to hold slaves. I do not. Those who doubt that members and ministers in the South have a right to hold slaves by the Constitution of the Church, may be very good men, but they are bad Methodists.'

I do not believe slaveholding is a disqualification for a Bishop, and I never will give such a vote. And after praising these southern slaveholding, man-stealing ministers for their piety, zeal, devotedness, &c. &c. he goes on to say, 'I am a slaveholder, and a minister myself, and had it not been for the fact that the climate did not agree with me, I should doubtless have been a slaveholder still.' These are the sentiments of men high in influence and office—the leaders, to a considerable degree, of public opinion in their own country, and men who have been honored during their visit to these countries. With such leaders, we are sorry to understand, public sentiment and public sympathy—particularly in the church—have become led to the claims of upwards of three millions of their suffering, down-trodden fellow-countrymen.

Before we close, allow us to give you the decision of a body of men, from whom we would naturally be led to expect an expression of sympathy for the slave—men set apart to speak of a pure morality, and the gospel of peace and good will to the heathen. Yet, strange to say, these men adopt no measures for giving the book which prescribes the purest of all morality—the Bible—nor express the slightest sympathy for the heathen at their own doors. The American Board of Foreign Missions met in New Haven, 8th Sept. 1846. Chancellor Walworth read a report on the memorial on slavery, the substance of which was, that the agitation on the question had an injurious effect, and therefore no action ought to be taken. Cool enough, certainly, for a Board of Missions!

ILLNESS OF HENRY C. WRIGHT.  
LEAVY GREAT SHEPHERD, Jan. 31st, 1847.

MY DEAR FRIEND:  
This time, a necessity is laid upon me to write to thee, (with no lack of inclination,) for our dear friend, H. C. Wright, is unable to do it, and he has commissioned me to write for him. His friends in America will be concerned to hear that, during the last week, he has been confined to his bed by illness. A week ago last night, Saturday, he went to bed in good health and spirits, and says he soon fell comfortably asleep, but soon after awoke in a violent fit of ague, which lasted some hours. In the morning, we found him in a weak and exhausted state. He remained so for some days—his strength so completely prostrated, that when, during the short time his bed was making, we had the greatest difficulty to prevent his fainting. The whole of his muscular frame was so extremely sore, that the least movement was painful. Wednesday was the first day we could perceive the least amendment, but, since then, his improvement has been quite satisfactory. The last two nights, he has set up for about half an hour with pleasure. He has not been willing to have medical advice, and has taken no medicine but water. Indeed, during the first part of his illness, it formed his only nourishment, and for several days he took nothing in addition but occasionally a small quantity of roasted apple, or a grape or two. We are all exceedingly pleased that our simple treatment has been so successful, and congratulate ourselves on having effected a cure in a much shorter time than would have been by any medical practitioner. I hope there is nothing left to do but to recruit the strength, and that nature, the best physician, will point out the means. His friends at home need not make themselves anxious about our dear friend. I trust his health will soon be completely restored, and that, before the sailing of the next steamer, he will be able to tell them so, with his own pen.

And now, I must make some report of his doings, before sickness deprived this most useful and benevolent friend of the ability to labor. I believe his last letters were written from Newcastle, or the neighborhood, but I do not remember to what date his report of the meetings in the North extended; and as I was not present, I am unable to say much about them. I heard they were highly satisfactory, and that wherever there was opposition, the result was favorable to the cause of abolition. From Northumberland and Durham, H. C. W. went to Kirkstall, to the house of our brother, in which village he held a peace meeting. He had then some other meetings within a short distance, all exciting great interest, but frequently provoking censure, from the unsparing manner with which he lashed those whose practices differed so widely from their Christian profession.

On the 13th, F. Douglass returned from Darlington to Kirkstall, where he also held a meeting. The subject of American slavery was quite new in the place, and the speech of Frederick excited a perfect enthusiasm of feeling. F. D.'s meeting at Darlington had been a highly interesting one, from the violent opposition made by one or two dissenting ministers, which ended, as all such opposition does, well for the cause. No doubt you will hear more particularly of these meetings from F. D.

On the 14th, a meeting for Frederick was appointed in the Music Hall, Leeds. The Mayor was in the chair; and it was such a meeting as would have cheered the hearts of many a poor, down-trodden slave, and of the noble band of Garrisonian abolitionists, could they have witnessed it. Oh, what a speech Frederick made! It was indescribably beautiful, sublime, pathetic and powerful. Often the enthusiasm of the audience knew no bounds. H. C. W. followed, and afterward Robert Smith, Secretary of the League, both of whom were listened to with great attention.

The next day, Friday, an anti-slavery meeting was held at Wakefield. This, too, was an excellent meeting. After H. C. W.'s speech, two persons came forward, and accused him of slandering the Evangelical Alliance. This occasioned some warm discussion, in which the audience were almost unanimously in favor of our friends; and the following day, the very men, one of them a Wesleyan, joined the League, and gave a subscription. Thus it is that every where the cause prospers.

On Saturday, the 16th, my sister and I returned to Leavy Great. At the Wakefield station, we were met by H. C. W., who accompanied us home, intending to rest for a week, after the fatigue of a long series of meetings in the North. We should have had the company of Frederick, too, but a meeting had been appointed for him in Manchester, on Monday; after which, he was to visit Coventry, and proceed to London. F. D. every where meets with kind friends, who are anxiously solicitous about him; and this is needed, as his exertions are often greater than he can bear without suffering from them. I had a very pleasant letter from him this morning, from Leamington, where probably he is now speaking, as he was to have a meeting there this evening. This place is in Warwickshire. From thence, he returns to London, to hold more meetings. He tells me, he was in the House of Lords, since the opening of Parliament, and heard Lord Brougham speak, which I am glad of, as I knew he was desirous to hear him.

During H. C. W.'s week of rest, he wrote a great many letters, wishing to finish up some writing before he again entered on more active labors. He walked with me into the town. The day was thaw, and the atmosphere extremely damp, and I believe this walk brought the complaint, which had long been lingering about him, to a crisis. We spent a particularly pleasant evening together around the fire, feeling the time was near when we must separate, never, perhaps, to spend much more time together in this world—little supposing that we had first to pass through a time of trial, that would unite us still more closely together. On Monday, the 20th, he was to leave us for Huddersfield, where three meetings had been appointed for him—on Temperance, Anti-War, and Anti-Slavery. It was a great trouble to him to disappoint those who had arranged for the meetings, knowing great pains had been taken to render them efficient.

No doubt some one will send over some of the tracts, 'The Christian Witness Examined.' We think it excellent. I wish I were so circumstanced as to have it in my power to give three more certain intelligence about the agitations, in which took so active a part when here. I trust, however, some of thy other friends will do it. Henry considers the cause of the League is making good and permanent progress. The almost all-absorbing subject of interest here, at present, is the state of Ireland, famishing from want of food, and the government measures for her relief. The opening of our ports, and suspension of the navigation laws, will, I suppose, cause great activity on your side of the Atlantic. It would be well for America to provide for us all the food, of all kinds, that she can, for we shall be able to consume as much as she will send.

Tuesday, 2nd.—Henry has had a good night, and is very comfortable this morning. He desires his love to thee, and wishes me to say, he hopes to be well enough to go to Dublin, about the middle of next week. This, I think, very doubtful, but it is well enough for him to have the pleasure of looking forward to it. The object of his going is to have a new edition of 'A Kiss for a Blow' printed. Since his coming into this part of Yorkshire, his books, particularly this small one, have been very extensively sold.

So far, the winter with us has been severe, though variable—the frost, though often intense, seldom continuing long. The winter is, however, considered

favorable for checking the vegetable diseases, which are at present producing effects so dreadful. Trade is bad, and there is much distress in various parts of the country, both of which are owing chiefly to the dearth of provisions, consequent on the failure of the potato crop. Since the meeting of Parliament, corn, particularly barley, has fallen in price—the effect of the legislative measures for the relief of the country. Allowing the use of sugar and molasses in distilleries has produced considerable effect. What a pity that any wholesome articles of food should be taken from the general consumption, to supply to a portion, an indulgence which destroys in them everything good and great!

Thy affectionate friend,  
MARY BRADY.

DONATIONS FOR THE STARVING PEOPLE IN IRELAND.

Amount acknowledged in last Liberator, \$329 00  
Eliza Lee Follen, West Roxbury, 5 00  
Friends in Hopkinton, Mass., by L. H. Bow, 33 54  
A. M. Chase, Canton, Mass., 3 00  
John S. Jacobs, 1, Edmund Jackson 100, James Jackson 30, Wendell Phillips 25, S. P. Hodges 5, Charles K. Whipple 5, George Jackson 5, Ruth Copeland 3, Wm. Shaw 1, all of Boston, 165 00  
J. T. Everett, Princeton, Mass., 1 00  
Sally B. Everett, do, 1 00  
Augustus Everett, do, 0 50  
E. F. by letter, Portland, Me., 25 00  
E. F. Rogers, North Marshfield, Mass., 3 00  
R. A. & S. Sisson, Pawtucket, by letter: 'Would that every mill could be multiplied ad infinitum—but the widow's mite was received and accepted.' 10 00  
Friends in Walpole, Mass



## POETRY.

For the Liberator.

## ERIN'S APPEAL.

A voice across the waters,  
 As 'twere a cry of fear,  
 From Erin's sons and daughters,  
 Is ringing on your ear.

Low, yet distinct, it swells  
 From weakness and despair:  
 The tale of woe it telleth,  
 What heart unmoved may bear?

We are sorrowful and weary,  
 We faint for lack of bread;  
 Our homes, alas! are dreary;  
 We share them with our dead!

Our dead we cannot bury,  
 They lie our huts about;  
 For we are feeble, very—  
 We cannot bear them out.

Manhood and childhood dying—  
 Sad sight to freeze the blood—  
 About our streets are lying,  
 And vainly murmur, 'Food!'

In vain the infant drowns  
 As pups whose founts are dry;  
 While on the breast he gnaweth,  
 Parent and infant die!

The mother, as she sinketh  
 Upon her straw at night,  
 Upon the morrow thinketh  
 With trembling and affright:

She sinks, but not to slumber;  
 She waiteth for the dawn,  
 That she may rise and number  
 What cherishers are gone!

Ye, whom the Lord has favored,  
 Import us of your store;  
 For we have vainly labored,  
 Reaping but famine sore.

We linger yet, where thickly  
 Are strewn our household dead;  
 Have pity on us quickly—  
 O give us, give us bread!

Lexington.

B. R. D.

## THE SPIRIT OF POETRY.

BY MARY HOWITT.

Men build to thee no shrine,  
 Yet every holy place is filled with thee;  
 Dim groves and mountain-tops alike are thine,  
 Spirit of Poetry!

Island and ocean peak,  
 Seas where the keel of ships shall never go;  
 Coats, palaces, and graves; where'er can speak  
 Of human love or woe;

All are the spheres where thou  
 Broodest with power, not visible, yet strong;  
 Like odor, from the rose, we know not how  
 Borne to the sense along:

Oh! spirit which art pure,  
 Mighty and holy, and of God art sprung;  
 Which teaches to aspire and to endure,  
 As ne'er taught human tongue;

What art thou? A glad spirit,  
 Sent down, like Hope, when Eden was no more,  
 From the high heavenly place thou didst inherit,  
 An Eden to restore;

Sent down to teach, as never  
 Taught worldly wisdom; to make known the right;  
 And the strong armor of sublime endeavor  
 To gird on for the fight.

I see whom thou hast called;  
 The mighty men, the chosen of the earth,  
 Strong minds invincible and disenthralled,  
 Made freemen at their birth.

I see, on spirit-wings,  
 How thou hast set them high, each like a star,  
 More royal than the loftiest names of kings,  
 Mightier than conquerors are;

How thou hast cast a glory  
 Over the dust of him sublimely wise,  
 The blind old man, with his immortal story  
 Of a lost Paradise;

How thou, by mountain-streams,  
 Met the poor peasant, and from passion's leaves  
 Refined his soul, wooing with holy themes  
 In Mary's voice from heaven.

'Twas thou that didst give the key  
 Of human hearts to Goethe, to unloose  
 Their sealed-up depths, like that old mystery  
 Of the wand-stricken rock.

All these I see, and more;  
 All crowned with glory, loftier than their race;  
 And, trembling, I shrink back, abashed and poor,  
 Unworthy of thy grace.

For what art I, that thou  
 Shouldst visit me in love, and give me might  
 To touch, like these, man's heart, his pride to bow,  
 Or, erring, lead him right?

Oh! dost thou visit me?  
 Is it thy spirit that I feel in all;  
 Thy light, yet brighter than the sun's, I see?  
 Is thine this spiritual call?

It is! It is! Though weak  
 And poor my spirit, thou dost condescend  
 Thy beauty to unveil, and with me speak  
 As gentle friend with friend.

With thee I walk the ways  
 Of daily life, and human tears and sighs  
 Interpreting, so learn to love my race,  
 And with them sympathize.

Hence is it that all tears  
 Which human sorrow sheds are dear to me;  
 That the soul struggling with its mortal fears,  
 Mourns me mightily.

Hence is it that the hearts  
 Of little children and unpractised youth  
 So gladden me with their unworried arts,  
 Their kindness and their truth.

Hence is it that the eye  
 And unken cheek of poverty so move—  
 Seen only by a glimpse in passing by—  
 My soul to human love.

Spirit, I will not say  
 Thou dost not visit me; nor yet repine,  
 Less mighty though I be, less great than they  
 Whom thou hast made divine.

From the Christian Freeman and Visitor.

## TO AMERICA.

The tramp of war is sounding  
 Along each hill and dale;  
 I hear the echo bounding  
 Borne on the rising gale.

Our brothers now lie bleeding,  
 Slain by a brother's hand;  
 The death-stroke now is speeding,  
 From murderous hand to band!

Say, call ye this true glory?  
 O, tell me ye who know,  
 Is this the Christian story  
 Of love to Mexico?

Widows and orphans crying  
 To God in their despair—  
 He will avenge their sighing,  
 And all the wrongs they bear.

Arouse thee, guilty nation!  
 Proclaim the conflict o'er—  
 Send forth the proclamation,  
 'The war shall be no more!'

Throughout thy wide dominions,  
 May truth and justice reign,  
 And gentle Peace her pinions  
 Spread o'er thee again.

Charleston, Dec. 1846.

P. H. B.

## REFORMATORY.

## THE SABBATH QUESTION.

BY CHARLES C. BURLINGAME.

No human authority can, in any case whatever,  
 Control or interfere with the rights of conscience.  
*Constitution of Pennsylvania.*

According to the theory of our government in this country, both State and National, perfect religious freedom is the inalienable birthright of all. No one can be required by law to adopt any civil or religious observance, however true or morally binding in the opinion of others, or in reality; but in all such matters, his own conscience is, under God, each individual's own law-giver and judge. The question above, from the Pennsylvania Constitution, is professionally regarded as a self-evident truth, and one of most vital importance.

But the practice does not always agree with the theory. Every Legislature in the Union interferes more or less with the rights of conscience, and in various ways. Their Sabbatical statutes are glaring instances of such interference. They have no more right to require the observance of the first day of the week as a Sabbath, and forbid labor and intrinsically innocent recreation on that day, than to command family legislation in religious matters, or to forbid the teaching of any doctrine but those of the majority. The Jew and the Seventh-day Baptist, who feel bound to rest on the last day of the week, may justly complain if they are forced to be idle on the first also, and are thus robbed of one-sixth of their working time, because they conscientiously obey the Sabbath law recorded in the Bible. And they, who esteem every day alike, and believe in pervading all their employments with that true and spiritual worship which the Father seeks, have as full a right to enjoy, and live out unmolested, their convictions, as have those who, clinging to a more formal dispensation, still go up to Jerusalem, whom Paul rebuked so sharply, 'observe days and months, and times and years.'

Every statute, therefore, which exacts conformity to the faith or usages of the majority in relation to the holiness and holy-keeping of a particular day, plainly violates the rights of the minority—nay, of the majority too; for law legislation in religious matters as truly invades the rights of conscience, when it enjoins what we consider our duty, as when it requires the opposite. It has no right to command any religious observance, right or wrong. It would be as truly guilty of usurpation in enjoining immersion upon a Baptist, as upon a Quaker; or arduous exertion upon a Catholic, as upon a Presbyterian. And they who urge the enactment, or oppose the repeal, of statutes for Sabbath-keeping, are extremely short-sighted; and without perceiving it, are fastening on themselves the fetters forged for others. Even if they should never change their position in relation to this particular case, so as to feed the iron entering their souls, they have established a precedent, which some day will be applied to other cases, where it will bear heavily upon them.

It may perhaps be replied, that labor and recreation on the first day of the week are forbidden, not to compel a religious observance of the day, but that those who choose to keep it holy may be undisturbed by the din and bustle of every day.

It is true, that among those who observe the first day, there are many who are not in the least disturbed by the din and bustle of every day. But the question is, whether the law is enacted for the sake of those who are not disturbed, or for the sake of those who are disturbed. If the law is enacted for the sake of those who are not disturbed, it is a law of convenience, and not of principle. If it is enacted for the sake of those who are disturbed, it is a law of principle, and not of convenience. The law of convenience is a law of expediency, and not of principle. The law of principle is a law of justice, and not of expediency. The law of expediency is a law of compromise, and not of principle. The law of principle is a law of truth, and not of compromise. The law of truth is a law of righteousness, and not of compromise. The law of righteousness is a law of holiness, and not of compromise. The law of holiness is a law of love, and not of compromise. The law of love is a law of peace, and not of compromise. The law of peace is a law of unity, and not of compromise. The law of unity is a law of harmony, and not of compromise. The law of harmony is a law of concord, and not of compromise. The law of concord is a law of agreement, and not of compromise. The law of agreement is a law of consent, and not of compromise. The law of consent is a law of assent, and not of compromise. The law of assent is a law of approval, and not of compromise. The law of approval is a law of acceptance, and not of compromise. The law of acceptance is a law of reception, and not of compromise. The law of reception is a law of inclusion, and not of compromise. The law of inclusion is a law of incorporation, and not of compromise. The law of incorporation is a law of integration, and not of compromise. The law of integration is a law of union, and not of compromise. The law of union is a law of communion, and not of compromise. The law of communion is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of preference, and not of compromise. The law of preference is a law of favor, and not of compromise. The law of favor is a law of grace, and not of compromise. The law of grace is a law of mercy, and not of compromise. The law of mercy is a law of compassion, and not of compromise. The law of compassion is a law of pity, and not of compromise. The law of pity is a law of sympathy, and not of compromise. The law of sympathy is a law of fellowship, and not of compromise. The law of fellowship is a law of partnership, and not of compromise. The law of partnership is a law of association, and not of compromise. The law of association is a law of connection, and not of compromise. The law of connection is a law of relation, and not of compromise. The law of relation is a law of correspondence, and not of compromise. The law of correspondence is a law of analogy, and not of compromise. The law of analogy is a law of comparison, and not of compromise. The law of comparison is a law of contrast, and not of compromise. The law of contrast is a law of distinction, and not of compromise. The law of distinction is a law of separation, and not of compromise. The law of separation is a law of division, and not of compromise. The law of division is a law of partition, and not of compromise. The law of partition is a law of allotment, and not of compromise. The law of allotment is a law of apportionment, and not of compromise. The law of apportionment is a law of distribution, and not of compromise. The law of distribution is a law of dispensation, and not of compromise. The law of dispensation is a law of delegation, and not of compromise. The law of delegation is a law of assignment, and not of compromise. The law of assignment is a law of appointment, and not of compromise. The law of appointment is a law of designation, and not of compromise. The law of designation is a law of nomination, and not of compromise. The law of nomination is a law of election, and not of compromise. The law of election is a law of choice, and not of compromise. The law of choice is a law of selection, and not of compromise. The law of selection is a law of